Old Testament is in advance of the New. The simple humanitarianism of the Biblical precept, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn" (Deuteronomy xxv. 4), contrasts strangely with Paul's comment, "Doth God take care for oxen?" (I Corinthians ix. 9). That all this is not a matter of twentieth century apologetics is made plain from Josephus *(Contra Apionem* II. 29), "So thorough a lesson has he (Moses) given us in gentleness and humanity that he does not overlook even the brute beasts"—a sentiment which Philo also echoes. Cattle and oxen and asses were enjoined to share in the Sabbatical repose (Exodus xx. 10; Deuteronomy v. 14): Nineveh was spared on account of its four-footed inhabitants, as well as the human beings (Jonah, last verse): the Psalmist praised God for preserving beast as well as man (Psalm xxxvi. 7).

This strain continues in the Talmud. Thus, from the verse, "And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, and thou mayest eat and be full" (Deuteronomy xL 15), it was deduced that a man should not sit down to table until he had fed his domestic animals: and, in a legend paraphrased by Coleridge, it was told how God marked out Moses as a fitting pastor for his people by reason of his devoted treatment of a lamb which had strayed.

Even the much-decried law of *Shehita,* or the ritual slaughter of animals, seems to have been dictated to a large extent by humane considerations.[1] This was in keeping with the Rabbinical conception, that cruelty to animals was a breach of the Divine law and of the Mosaic

code. It has been pointed out that, until the nineteenth century, cruelty to animals was nowhere illegal—except-ing under Jewish law.

[1] "I should be happy to think that my own end were likely to be as swift and painless as the end of these cattle killed in this [the Jewish] way undoubtedly is." (Lovat Evans, Professor of Physiology in the University of London.)